



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,449	07/11/2001	Hawley K. Rising III	020699-002100US	9713
7590	11/22/2004		EXAMINER	
Maria Sobrino Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			CORRIELOS, JEAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/904,449	Applicant(s) RISING, HAWLEY K.
	Examiner Jean M Corrielus	Art Unit 2162

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____.



 Jean M Corrielus
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 2162

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Seagraves and Beller disclose substantially the invention as broadly claimed. Applicant asserted that the invention as claimed is directed to a concept that is a collection of properties of the audiovisual information, and, therefore, Beller provides no suggestion that properties of the visual/audible signals are collected into a concept. It is respectfully submitted that Beller discloses a hierarchical architecture for building and maximizing the accuracy of predictive models, which is a mathematical structure that simulates human learning by providing advanced non-relational query processing capabilities. Beller, however, discloses the use of auditory visual signals, which identify an entity represented by a datum, such as using a series of words to describe what another datum means. Beller also provides the use of suitable representations of other meaningful data relationship (col.1, lines 8-25; col.22, lines 25-22). Beller discloses the claimed "wherein the entity describes a non-relational part of a semantic description, and the concept is a collection of properties of the audiovisual information" (col.22, lines 25-32). Application, (remark page 2), admits that it is common and well known in the art, audiovisual information can be described in textual terms as a series of related objects, events, and attributes of the objects and events, wherein the textual terms form a semantic description of the audiovisual information, which is in fact represented as a data structure containing entries representing the objects, events, and attributes. In addition, such a semantic description also contains entries that define the relationships among the objects and events. Therefore, the claimed limitation that Applicant is relied upon is old and the well known in the art (see Applicant remark, page 2 fourth paragraph). The aforementioned rejection is moot.